

## REMARKS

This document is being filed in response to an Office Action mailed 05/04/2005, in which the Examiner said that claims 1-53 were pending but rejected. This document is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination and a request for an extension of time of one month. In this amendment, claims 1, 10, 18, 26, 34, 44, and 50 are amended to overcome reasons given by the Examiner for rejections, and claims 1 and 42 are canceled.

### **Claims Rejected under 35 USC §103**

#### **Claims Rejected over Baltzley in View of Chandra et al.**

In the above-mentioned Office Action, the Examiner said that claims 1-2, 4-14, 16-22, 24-30, 32-32, 40, 42-47 and 49-53 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,154,153 to Baltzley and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,817,140 to Chandra et al.

**Referring to claim 1**, in this amendment, this claim is modified to require that the system must additionally include a plurality of computer readable media, each of which is transportable to each of the client computers and readable within each of the client computers, and which include the computer readable media on which recorded and read. Support for this modification is found in the specification as originally filed on page 14, lines 18-22, and on page 17, line 24, through page 18, line 8.

This claim is also modified to include a requirement that each client computer is programmed to be enabled to perform a predetermined task after decrypting the portion of token data. Support for this modification is found in the specification on page 23, lines 17-23,

This claim is further modified to include a requirement that the server must be separate from the plurality of associated client computers. Support for this modification is found in the specification on page 14, lines 12-18. This distinction is significant because it provides for a structure in which the server is used to establish control of the process by determining the client computers to which the secure transfer key pair is sent, while allowing the user to generate a token within any of the client computers.

Baltzley does not describe the recording of data on computer readable media that are transportable among the client computers. Instead, Baltzley describes the use of a passphrase that is entered by the user, instead of a computer readable medium that is transportable among the client systems. Chandra et al. describes the use of data recorded on a computer readable medium to enable the operation of a coprocessor, but the client systems, which read the data are not programmed to generate the data recorded on the computer readable medium. Such data is only generated and recorded in a system manufacturing the media on which the protected information is also being recorded. In particular, Chandra et al. does not describe a secure transfer pair being generated in a server so that token data can subsequently be recorded in a client system separate from the server.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Baltzley and Chandra et al., taken separately or in combination, fail to include the requirement of claim 1, as modified herein, for each of the client computers to be programmed to generate token data including said portion of said token data encrypted with a public key of said secure transfer key pair, to record said token data on a computer readable medium in said plurality of computer readable media that are transportable to each of the client computers. Additionally, the Applicants respectfully submit that Baltzley and Chandra et al., taken separately or in combination do not describe or otherwise anticipate the requirements of claim 1, as modified herein, for the

system to include a server separate from the plurality of client computers, for the server to transfer the secure transfer key to each of the client computers, and for the client computer to be programmed to generate the token data using the secure transfer key. For these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al.

**Regarding claims 2 and 5-9**, since these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al. for reasons discussed above regarding claim 1.

**Regarding claim 4**, this claim is canceled herein, since its limitations have been added to claim 1.

**Regarding claims 10, 18, and 26**, in this amendment, these claims are modified to indicate that the method is for generating a token causing a computer system in a plurality of computer systems to be enabled to perform a predetermined task and for reading a token to be enabled to perform a predetermined task. Support for this modification is found in the specification on page 14, lines 18-22, and on page 17, line 24, through page 18, line 8.

These claims are also modified to include a requirement that the method in a computer system includes being enabled to perform a predetermined task after decrypting said portion of said data. Support for this modification is also found in the specification on page 14, lines 18-22, and on page 17, line 24, through page 18, line 8.

These claims are further modified to include a requirement that the server from which the secure transfer pair is transmitted must be separate from the computer

receiving the secure transfer pair for subsequent use in writing and reading token data from computer readable media. Support for this modification is found in the specification on page 14, lines 12-18. This distinction is significant because it provides for a structure in which the server is used to establish control of the process by determining the client computers to which the secure transfer key pair is sent, while allowing the user to generate a token within any of the client computers.

Baltzley does not describe the recording of data on computer readable media that are transportable among the client computers. Instead, Baltzley describes the use of a passphrase that is entered by the user, instead of a computer readable medium that is transportable among the client systems. Chandra et al. describes the use of data recorded on a computer readable medium to enable the operation of a coprocessor, but the client systems, which read the data are not programmed to generate the data recorded on the computer readable medium. Such data is only generated and recorded in a system manufacturing the media on which the protected information is also being recorded. In particular, Chandra et al. does not describe a secure transfer pair being generated in a server so that token data can subsequently be recorded in a client system separate from the server.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Baltzley and Chandra et al., taken separately or in combination, fail to include the requirement of claims 10, 18, and 26, as modified herein, for a method to be for generating a token causing a computer system in a plurality of computer systems to be enabled to perform a predetermined task and for reading a token to be enabled to perform a predetermined task, and further for the method to include a step of after storing said secure transfer key pair, in response to an indication that token data is to be recorded, encrypting a portion of said token data with a public key of said secure transfer key pair; and recording said token data, including said portion of said

token data encrypted with said public key of said secure transfer key pair on a computer readable medium. The Applicants additionally respectfully submit that Baltzley and Chandra et al. fail to anticipate the requirement of claims 10, 18, and 26, as amended herein for the secure token to be transmitted from a server separate from the computer system subsequently using it to write and read the token data. For these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 18, and 26, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al.

**Regarding claims 11-14, 16 and 17,** since these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 10, the Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al. for reasons discussed above regarding claims 10, 18, and 26.

**Regarding claims 19-22, 24 and 25,** since these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 18, the Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al. for reasons discussed above regarding claims 10, 18, and 26.

**Regarding claims 27-30, 32 and 33,** since these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 26, the Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al. for reasons discussed above regarding claims 10, 18, and 26.

**Regarding claim 34,** in the above-mentioned Office Action, the Examiner said that Baltzley teaches recording said token data...on a computer readable medium and transporting said computer readable medium to said remote computer. Regarding this statement, the Applicants respectfully submit that Baltzley fails to teach recording such data on a computer readable medium and

transporting the computer readable medium to a remote computer. Instead, the user is given a passphrase to remember for use in the remote computer.

5 In this amendment, claim 34 is amended to require that the method is additionally for performing a predetermined task in a local computer, with the token data recorded on the computer readable medium additionally being read in the local computer, with the portion of token data being decrypted in the local computer, and with the local computer being enabled to perform a predetermined task. Support for this modification is found in the specification. Support for this  
10 modification is found in the specification on page 18, lines 6-8.

This claim is further modified to include a requirement that the server must be separate from the local computer and from the remote computer. Support for this modification is found in the specification on page 14, lines 12-18. This distinction  
15 is significant because it provides for a structure in which the server is used to establish control of the process by determining the client computers to which the secure transfer key pair is sent, while allowing the user to generate a token within any of the client computers.

20 While Chandra et al. describes reading data on a computer readable medium to enable operations within a computing system, Chandra et al. fails to describe or otherwise anticipate writing data on a disk within a local computer, with the data subsequently being read within the local computer to enable performing a task in the local computer and within a remote computer to enable performing a task in  
25 the remote computer. In particular, Chandra et al. does not describe a secure transfer pair being generated in a server so that token data can subsequently be recorded in a client system separate from the server.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Baltzley and Chandra et al., taken  
30 separately or in combination, fail to anticipate the requirements of claim 34, as

amended herein, for a method for performing a predetermined task in a local computer, as well as within a remote computer, with the token data recorded on the computer readable medium additionally being read in the local computer, with the portion of token data being decrypted in the local computer, and with the local computer being enabled to perform a predetermined task. The Applicants further submit that Baltzley and Chandra et al. do not anticipate the requirement of claim 34, as amended herein, for the secure transfer key pair to be generated in a server separate from the local and remote computers and transferred to the local computer. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al.

**Regarding claims 35-38, 40, and 43,** since these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 34, the Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al. for reasons discussed above regarding claims 10, 18, and 34.

**Regarding claim 42,** this claim is cancelled herein because its limitations are otherwise included within claim 34.

**Regarding claims 44 and 50,** in this amendment, these claims are modified to include a requirement that the server must be separate from the plurality of associated client computers. Support for this modification is found in the specification on page 14, lines 12-18. This distinction is significant because it provides for a structure in which the server is used to establish control of the process by determining the client computers to which the secure transfer key pair is sent, while allowing the user to generate a token within any of the client computers.

Baltzley does not describe the recording of data on computer readable media that are transportable among the client computers. Instead, Baltzley describes the use of a passphrase that is entered by the user, instead of a computer readable medium that is transportable among the client systems. Chandra et al. describes the use of data recorded on a computer readable medium to enable the operation of a coprocessor, but the client systems, which read the data are not programmed to generate the data recorded on the computer readable medium. Such data is only generated and recorded only in a system manufacturing the media on which the protected information is also being recorded. In particular, Chandra et al. does not describe a secure transfer pair being generated in a server so that token data can subsequently be recorded in a client system separate from the server.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Baltzley and Chandra et al., taken separately or in combination, fail to include the requirement of claims 44 and 50, as modified herein, for the generation of a secure transfer key pair in a server separate from the plurality of associated client servers and for the transfer of the secure transfer key from the server to each client computer within the plurality of client computers. For this reason, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 44 and 50 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al.

**Regarding claims 45-47 and 49**, since these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 44, the Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al. for reasons discussed above regarding claims 44 and 50

**Regarding claims 51-53**, since these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 50, the Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are



patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Chandra et al. for reasons discussed above regarding claims 44 and 50.

**Claims Rejected over Baltzley in View of Taafe**

5 In the above-mentioned Office Action, the Examiner said that claims 3, 15, 23, 31, 39, 41, and 48 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,154,153 to Baltzley and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,747,139 to Taafe.

10 **Regarding claim 3**, the Applicants respectfully submit that adding the disclosure of Taafe to that of Baltzley does not overcome the deficiencies of Baltzley in describing the limitations of claim 1, to which claim 3 merely adds limitations, with these deficiencies having been described in detail above regarding claim 1, and that, therefore, claim 3 is patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view  
15 of Taafe.

**Regarding claim 15**, the Applicants respectfully submit that adding the disclosure of Taafe to that of Baltzley does not overcome the deficiencies of Baltzley in describing the limitations of claim 10, to which claim 15 merely adds  
20 limitations, with these deficiencies having been described in detail above regarding claim 10, and that, therefore, claim 15 is patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Taafe.

**Regarding claim 23**, the Applicants respectfully submit that adding the disclosure of Taafe to that of Baltzley does not overcome the deficiencies of  
25 Baltzley in describing the limitations of claim 18, to which claim 23 merely adds limitations, with these deficiencies having been described in detail above regarding claim 18, and that, therefore, claim 23 is patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Taafe.

30

5       **Regarding claim 31**, the Applicants respectfully submit that adding the disclosure of Taffee to that of Baltzley does not overcome the deficiencies of Baltzley in describing the limitations of claim 26, to which claim 31 merely adds limitations, with these deficiencies having been described in detail above regarding claim 26, and that, therefore, claim 31 is patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Taffee.

10       **Regarding claims 39 and 41**, the Applicants respectfully submit that adding the disclosure of Taffee to that of Baltzley does not overcome the deficiencies of Baltzley in describing the limitations of claim 34, to which claims 39 and 41 merely add limitations, with these deficiencies having been described in detail above regarding claim 34, and that, therefore, claims 39 and 41 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Taffee.

15       **Regarding claim 48**, the Applicants respectfully submit that adding the disclosure of Taffee to that of Baltzley does not overcome the deficiencies of Baltzley in describing the limitations of claim 44, to which claim 48 merely adds limitations, with these deficiencies having been described in detail above regarding claim 44, and that, therefore, claim 48 is patentable under 35 USC  
20       §103(a) over Baltzley in view of Taffee.

### **Conclusions**

25       The Applicants respectfully submit that the application, including claims 1-3, 5-41, and 43-53 is now in condition for allowance, and that action is earnestly requested, with reconsideration and reversal of reasons given for rejections.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Ronald V. Davidge*

Ronald V. Davidge

5 Registration No. 33,863

Telephone No. 954-344-9880

September 6, 2005